

## REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks Examiner McDonald for the courtesies extending during the interview held February 12, 2007.

Claims 1-11, 30-39 and 46-65 are pending. Claims 49-61 have been withdrawn from consideration and Claims 12-29 and 40-45 have been canceled.

All claims under consideration stand rejected under Section 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,949,005 to Parham et al. ("Parham '005") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,536,991 to Parham et al. ("Parham '991") and one or more additional references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

### Allowable Claims

The Office Action, at page 11, states that claims 7 and 63 are allowable. Additionally, during the interview of February 12, 2007, the Examiner agreed with Applicant that the art of record did not teach the recitation of independent claims 39, 64 and 65. Applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, allowability of claims 7, 39 and 63-65.

### Claim Amendment

The claims have been amended by replacing "preventing" with "shielding". Support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification, for example, at Figs. 13 and 14 as well as the paragraph bridging pages 25 and 26 of the specification. Further, the amended recitation appears at claims 39 and 64. Accordingly, the amendment does not require additional search and consideration. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

### Obviousness Rejection

Claims 1, 8, 11, 30-32, 34-35 and 62 stand rejected as allegedly obvious over Parham '005 in view of Parham '991 and Patent No. 4,959,585 to Hoegler. The rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In one embodiment, the disclosure is directed to a method and apparatus for shielding the lamp from heat source disposed proximate to the bulbous light emitting chamber of the lamp. Independent claims 1, 11, 30, 37 and 46 require, in various terms recited below, shielding the coating from the heat of the hermetic sealing process. To this end, the claims recite, *inter alia*:

- Claim 1: “shielding the coated surface of the bulbous light emitting chamber from the heat source”.
- Claim 11: “shielding the coated surfaces from at least one heat source disposed proximate the bulbous light emitting chamber”.
- Claim 30: “shielding the deposited layer of material from at least one heat source disposed proximate the bulbous light emitting chamber”.
- Claim 37: “shielding the exposure of the coated portions of the burner envelope to temperatures greater than the certain temperature”.
- Claim 46: “shielding said coated surface from at least one heat source disposed proximate to the bulbous light emitting chamber”.

The references, even if combined fail to disclose or suggest the claimed features. Parham ‘005 discloses a thin film interference filter consisting of alternating layers of tantalum and silica. See col. 2, lines 43-50. In a preferred embodiment, Parham ‘005 discloses an interference filter consisting of 12 layers of silica alternating with 12 layers of tantalum for a total of 24 layers. See col. 4, lines 26-33. After the layers are coated, the lamp substrate is heated to a temperature of about 550-675 °C. See col. 6, lines 13-17. Parham ‘005 does not disclose nor suggest shielding the coated surfaces from a heat source during the heating step.

Parham ‘991 also fail to disclose the claimed features. Parham ‘991 is directed to a protective silica coating for protecting the reflective coating of the lamp from abrasion. At col. 1, lines 39-41, Parham ‘991 discloses that the lamp’s reflective coatings are not durable and typically have low abrasion resistance. To this end, the reference teaches a silica protective coating to protect the reflective coating. See col. 2, lines 1-2. Parham ‘991 also fails to disclose or suggest shielding the coated surfaces from a heat source during.

The Examiner cites to Hoegler for teaching a coated lamp having “bulbous elliptical lamp” (see Office Action at page 4) this reference also fails to cure deficiencies of Parham ‘005

and Parham '991 as it fails to disclose or suggest shielding the coated surface of the lamp from a heat source.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that each independent claim 1, 11, 30, 37 and 46 (as amended) is patentable over the art of record. Claims 2-10, 31-36, 38 and 47-48 depend from one of independent claims 1, 30, 37 and 46 and are deemed patentable at least by the virtue of this dependence. Accordingly, additional reasons for patentability will not be proffered.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future, including extension of time fees, to **Deposit Account 04-1679**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

D. Joseph English  
Reg. No. 42,514

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 776-7800  
Fax: (202) 776-7801

Dated: February 16, 2007